Section: Research Paper
ISSN 2063-5346

COMPARITIVE STUDY OF GEOPOLYMER CONCRETE OVER TRADITIONAL CONCRETE BY COST ANALYSIS DEVELOPMENT

Dr. Shilpa Singla
Designation Assistant Professor
Department of Civil Engineering
College: Sant Longowal Institute of Engineering and Technology
e-mail Shilpasingla90@gmail.com

Revised: 10-Feb-2023 Accepted: 20-March-2023 Published: April 2023
DOI: 10.48047/ecb/2023.12.si4.1649

ABSTRACT

This paper is focuses on Comparative Study of Geopolymer Concrete over Traditional Concrete and also using Cost Analysis. The geopolymer technology proposed by Davidovits (1978) shows considerable promise for application in concrete industry as an alternative binder to the Portland cement. Geopolymer can be consider as the key factor which does not utilize Portland cement, nor releases greenhouse gases. He proposed that binders could be proposed by a polymeric reaction of alkaline liquids with the silicon and the aluminium in source materials of geopolymer origin or by-product materials such as Fly Ash, Ground Granulated blast furnace slag ,Rice-Husk Ash etc. He termed these binder as geopolymers. Among the waste or by-product materials, Fly Ash and Slag are the mostpotential source of geopolymers.

The objective of this project is to study the effect of class Fly Ash (FA) and Ground Granulated Blast Furnace Slag (GGBS) on the micro properties of geopolymer concrete (GPC) at different replacement levels (FA0-GGBS100, FA25-GGBS75, FA50- GGBS50, FA75-GGBS25, FA100-GGBS0)). Sodium silicate (Na_2SiO_3) and sodium hydroxide (NaOH) solution will be used as alkaline activators. The molar ratio of hydroxide solution considered in the investigation is 10M. The result shows that the mechanical decrease with increase in FA content in the mix irrespective of different curing periods like 7, 28, 56 and 90 days at ambient room temperature.

Key words: Geopolymer Concrete, Sodium Silicate, Sodium Hydroxide, Fly Ash, Granulated Blast Furnace Slag

1. INTRODUCTION

The Geopolymer Technology having an Important role and is being projected by Davidovits (1978) gives substantial promise for application in concrete industries. In terms of reducing International warming, the geopolymer technology could reduce the co_2 emission into the environment, caused by cement and aggregate industries about 80%. In this technology ,the source material that is FA and GGBS, Fly Ash and Ground Granulated Blast Furnace slag in silicon (si) and aluminum (Al) is reacts with a highly alkaline solution through the process of geopolymerisation to create the binding material.

2. MATERIALS

Although geopolymer concrete can be made using various source materials, the present study

Section: Research Paper
ISSN 2063-5346

used Class F fly ash and GGBS. Also, as in the case of OPC, the aggregates occupied 75-80 % of the total mass of concrete. The following sections discuss constituent materials used for manufacturing GPC. Chemical and physical properties of the constituent materials are presented in this section.

2.1. FLY ASH MTERIAL

According to ASTM C 618 (2003), Class F fly ash produced from Rayalaseema Thermal Power Plant (RTPP), Muddanur, and A.P. was used.

2.2. GROUND GRANULATED BLAST FURNACE SLAG MATERIAL

In the present investigation, GGBS produced from the Vizag steel plant was used in the manufacturing of GPC.

2.3. FINE AGGREGATE

Natural river sand was used as fine aggregate. The bulk specific gravity in oven dry condition and water absorption of the sand as per IS 2386 (Part III, 1963) were 2.62 and 1% respectively.

2.4. COURSE AGGREGATE MATERIAL

Crushed granite stones of size 20 mm and 10 mm were used as coarse aggregate. The bulk specific gravity in oven dry condition and water absorption of the coarse aggregate 20 mm and 10mm as per IS 2386 (Part III, 1963) were 2.58 and 0.30% respectively.

2.5. ALKALINE LIQUIDE

The alkaline liquid used was a combination of sodium silicate solution and sodium hydroxide solution. The sodium silicate solution (Na2O= 13.7%, SiO2=29.4%, and water=55.9% by mass) was purchased from a local supplier. The sodium hydroxide (NaOH) in flakes or pellets from with 97%-98% purity was also purchased from a local supplier. The sodium hydroxide (NaOH) solution was prepared by dissolving either the flakes or the pellets in water. The mass of NaOH solids in a solution diverse depending on the concentration of the solution which is expressed in terms of molar, M. For instance, NaOH solution with a concentration of 10M consisted of 10x40 = 400 grams of NaOH solids (in flake or pellet form) per litre of the solution, where 40 is the molecular weight of NaOH.

3. MIX DESIGN SYSTEM

Based on the limited past research on GPC (Hardjito & Rangan, 2005), the following proportions were selected for the constituents of the mixtures.

- The combined mass of coarse and fine aggregates has taken as 77% of the mass of concrete.
- Ratio of activator solution-to-fly ash and GGBS, by mass, in the range of 0.3 and 0.4. This ratio was fixed at 0.35.
- Class F fly ash and GGBS (FA100-GGBS0; FA25-GGBS75; FA50-GGBS50; FA75-GGBS25; FA0-GGBS100).
- Ratio of sodium silicate solution-to-sodium hydroxide solution, by mass, of 0.4 to 2.5. This ratio was fixed at 2.5 for most of the mixtures, because the sodium silicate solution is considerably cheaper than the sodium hydroxide solution.
- Molarity of sodium hydroxide (NaOH) solution was kept at 10M.
- Calculate water-to-geopolymer solids.

Section: Research Paper
ISSN 2063-5346

- Extra water, when added, in mass.
- M45 grade of conventional concrete (CC) has been designed (refer Appendix (B) asper **IS 10262 (2009)** and **IS 456 (2000)** for comparative study.

The CC and geopolymer concrete mixture proportions are given as follows:

Table 1. GPC mix proportions

Materials		**Mass (kg/m^3)**					
		M45	FA0-GGBS100	FA25-GGBS75	FA50-GGBS50	FA75-GGBS25	FA100-GGBS0
Coarse aggregate	20mm	606	776	776	776	776	776
	10mm	404	517	517	517	517	517
Fine aggregate		625	554	554	554	554	554
Cement		533	0	0	0	0	0
Fly ash (Class F)		0	0	102.2	204.5	306.7	409
GGBS		0	409	306.7	204.5	102.2	0
Sodiu silicate solution		0	102	102	102	102	102
Sodium hydroxide solution		0	41 (10M)	41(10M)	41 (10M)	41 (10M)	41(10M)
Extra water		0	55	55	55	55	55
Alkaline solution/ (FA+GGBS) (by weight)		0	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35
Water/ geopolymer solids (by weight)		0	0.29	0.29	0.29	0.29	0.29

Fly Ash

Ground Granulated Blast Furnance Slag(GGBS)

Section: Research Paper
ISSN 2063-5346

10mm Coarse Aggregate **20mm coarse aggregate**

Fine aggregate **Sodium hydroxide**

Sodium silicate

3.1. Compressive Strength on Geopolymer Concrete System

Compressive strength test was conducted on the cubical specimens for all the mixes after 7, 28, 56 and 90 days of curing as per IS 516 (1991). Three cubical specimens of size 150 mm x 150 mm x 150 mm were cast and tested for each age and each mix. The compressive strength (f'_c) of the specimen was calculated by dividing the maximum load applied to the specimen by the cross-sectional area of the specimen.

The compressive strength values of GPC mixes were measured after 7, 28, 56 and 90 days of curing. These compressive strength properties were then compared to that of M45 grade of conventional concrete (CC).

The compressive strength of CC (M45) and GPC mixes (FA100-GGBS0; FA25-GGBS75;FA50-GGBS50; FA75-GGBS25; FA0-GGBS100) at different curing periods.

Table 2. Compressive strength of CC and GPC

Mechanical property	Age	Mix type					
		M45	FA0-GGBS100	FA25-GGBS75	FA50-GGBS50	FA75-GGBS25	FA100-GGBS0
	7	26.12	54.29	51.11	35.30	13.30	10.51

Section: Research Paper
ISSN 2063-5346

Compressive strength p_c (MPA)	28	51.39	60.23	58.12	46.32	15.55	12.11
	56	54.23	63.11	59.02	48.33	28.22	18.68
	90	56.34	65.23	62.32	51.78	33.02	22.03

4. GEOPOLYMER CONCRETE OVER TRADITIONAL CONCRETE BY USING COST ANALYSIS DEVELOPMENT

The compressive strength test can be relatively easily conducted. Hence, the most frequently conducted test on concrete is the compressive strength test. The compressive strength at 28 days after casting is taken as a criterion for specifying the quality of concrete which is called grade of concrete. The concrete develops strength with continued hydration. The rate of gain of strength is earlier to start with and the rate gets reduced with age. It is customary to assume the 28 days strength as the full strength of concrete.

This section mainly focused on the cost analysis of GPC (FA39-GGBS69) and M45 grade of CC. Time, cost and quality are the three important factors which assume significance in construction due to their impact on the industry as a whole. Any development which has positive impact on these factors is always in the interest of civil engineering.

The 28 days compressive strength of M45 grade CC is 51.39Mpa. In order to achieve the same strength in case of GPC, the proportion of FA: GGBS is 39: 61. Hence, in this chapter the cost of one cubic meter of GPC for the above proportion is worked out and is compared with the cost of one cubic meter of M45 grade of CC.

Calculations of quantities of dry ingredients of CC and GPC for the cost analysis are presented in Table 3 and 4 respectively.

Table 3 Calculation of quantities of dry ingredients of CC

Quantity calculation of M45 grade of CC						
Dry co-efficient of concrete : 1.52 (a)						
Material	Weight (Kg/m^3) (b)	Specific gravity (c)	Volume (m^3) (d)=(b)/(c)	Volume Proportions (e)=(d)/(f)	Quantity per cubic meter of concrete (m^3) (h)=(e)*(a)/(g)	Remarks
Cement	533	3.06	174.18 (f)	1.00	0.33	Let 1 cement bag of 50 kg = 0.0347 m^3 volume
Sand	625	2.62	238.55	1.37	0.45	
CA 20	606.4	2.58	235.04	1.35	0.44	
CA 10	404.3	2.658	156.71	0.90	0.30	
Total volume of proportions				4.62 (g)	Total: 1.52	

Table 4 Calculation of quantities of dry ingredients of GPC

Quantity calculation of M45 grade of GPC						
Material	Weight (Kg/m^3) (b)	Specific gravity (c)	Volume (m^3) (d)=(b)/(c)	Volume Proportions (e)=(d)/(f)	Quantity per cubic meter of concrete (m^3) (h)=(e)*(a)/(g)	Remarks

ISSN 2063-5346

GGBS	249.49	2.9	86.03 (f)	1.00	0.14	
Fly ash	159.51	2.12	72.17	0.87	0.12	
Sand	554	2.62	211.45	2.50	0.37	
CA 20	776	2.58	300.78	3.49	0.52	
CA 10	517	2.58	200.39	2.32	0.34	
Total volume of proportions				10.18 (g)	Total: 1.49	

Table 5 Cost analysis of M45 grade of CC and GPC

Material	Unit	Rate (Rs)	Control concrete (M45)		GPC (FA39-GGBS61)	
			Quantity	Amount (Rs)	Quantity	Amount (Rs)
Cement	Bags	250	9.51	2377.50	0	0.00
GGBS	m^3	70	0	0	0.14	9.8
Fly ash	m^3	65	0	0	0.12	7.8
CA 20	m^3	1076	0.44	473.44	0.54	559.52
CA 10	m^3	788	0.30	236.40	0.34	267.92
Sand	m^3	375	0.45	168.75	0.37	138.75
Sodium silicate solution	Litre	24	0	0	102	2448.00
NaOH pellets	Kg	55	0	0	16	880.00
Total				3256.09		4311.79
Cost over CC(%)						32.42

Cost analysis of M_{45} grade of CC and GPC is made as per standard schedule of rates **(SSR (2013))** and is presented in Table 3. From the Table 3, it is found that the initial material cost of GPC (FA0-GGBS100) was about 32% higher than that of CC (M_{45}). Obviously, the higher material cost of GPC over CC gives a feeling that GPC is much costlier than CC for the same strength.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results reported in this investigation, the following conclusions are drawn

1. The compressive strength of Geopolymer concrete decrease with increase in FA content in the mix irrespective of curing period.
2. For a given proportion of mix, the compressive strength increase with age.
3. The compressive strength of Geopolymer concrete is maximum, when the mix proportion FA: GGBS: 0:100 irrespective of curing period.
4. The initial material cost of GPC (FA39-GGBS61) is about 32% higher than that of CC (M45) at 28 days' compressive strength.

Section: Research Paper
ISSN 2063-5346

REFERENCES

[1] IS 10262 (2009). Concrete Mix Proportioning-Guidelines. Bureau of Indian Standards, New Delhi.

[2] J. Davidovits, “Global Warming Impact on the Cement and Aggregate Industries”, World Resource review, Vol. 6, no. 2, 1994, pp. 263-278.

[3] Palomo, A.; Grutzeck, M.W.; Blanco, M.T. (1999). Alkali-activated fly ashes – A cement for the future. Cement and Concrete Research, 29(8), 1323-1329.

[4] IS 2386 (1963). Methods of test for aggregates for concrete. Part III - Specific gravity, Density, Voids, Absorption and Bulking. Bureau of Indian Standards, New Delhi.

[5] IS 383 (1970). Specification for coarse and fine aggregates from natural sources for concrete. Bureau of Indian Standards, New Delhi.

[6] Hardjito, D., & Rangan, B. V. (2005). Development and Properties of Low-Calcium Fly Ash-Based Geopolymer Concrete. Research Report GC1, Perth, Australia: Faculty of Engineering, Curtin University of Technology.

[7] IS 456 (2000). Plain and reinforced concrete code for practice. Bureau of Indian Standards, New Delhi.

[8] J. Davidovits, “Geopolymers: Man-Made Geosynthesis andthe Resulting Development of Very Early High StrengthCement”, J. Materials Education Vol. 16 (2&3), 1994, pp. 91-139.

[9] P. Nath and P.K. Sarker, “Effect of GGBS on setting, workability and early strength properties of fly ash geopolymer concrete cured in ambient condition”, Construction Building Materials Vol. 66, 2014, pp. 163-171

[10] P.K. Sarker, S. Kelly and Z. Yao, “Effect of exposure on cracking, spalling and residual strength of fly ash geopolymer concrete”, Materials and Design Vol. 63, 2014, pp. 584-592.